

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APPLN. NO. 10/000,065
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q67493

REMARKS

Applicant requests that the Examiner acknowledge Applicant's claim to foreign priority, and to indicate that the certified copy of the priority document, Japanese Patent Application No. 2001-009024 dated January 17, 2001, has been made of record in the file.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for initialing the references listed on the PTO-1449 form submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on December 4, 2001, thereby confirming that the listed references have been considered.

Claims 1-7 have been examined on their merits.

Claims 1-7 have been editorially amended for reasons of precision of language. The amendments to claims 1-7 were made merely to more accurately claim the present invention and do not narrow the literal scope of the claims and thus do not implicate an estoppel in the application of the doctrine of equivalents. The amendments to claims 1-7 were not made for reasons of patentability.

Claims 1-7 are all the claims presently pending in the application.

1. The Examiner objects to claims 2-5 due to informalities. Applicant herein amends claims 2-5 to recite "claim 1" instead of "claim1". The amendments to claims 2-5 were made merely to more accurately claim the present invention and do not narrow the literal scope of the claims and thus do not implicate an estoppel in the application of the doctrine of equivalents. The amendments to claims 2-5 were not made for reasons of patentability.

2. Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Dermer (U.S. Patent No. 5,668,931). Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 1-7 at least for the reasons discussed below.

To support a conclusion that a claimed invention lacks novelty under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must teach all of the elements of a claim. *Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 1986). A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found either expressly or inherently in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). A single source must disclose all of the claimed elements arranged as in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are proper only when the claimed subject matter is identically disclosed or described in the prior art. Thus, the cited reference must clearly and unequivocally disclose every element and limitation of the claimed invention.

With respect to claim 1, Dermer fails to teach or suggest the division of an image represented in the form of polygons into a plurality of image areas or creating band-shaped trapping areas extending along the boundary of a pair of image areas. Dermer discloses, *inter alia*, that after scan processing, a new boundary map is created. *See, e.g.*, Fig. 12 and col. 15, lines 24-33 of Dermer. Dermer does not teach or suggest, however, dividing an image — comprised of polygons into a plurality of image areas. Instead, Dermer simply discloses rearranging the boundaries of the shapes comprising the image. Division of the image into a plurality of image areas is not performed. For example, color regions 210 and 220 are simply

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APPLN. NO. 10/000,065
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q67493

remapped into the color regions 210 and 220 shown in Figure 14a or 14b of Dermer. Color region 220 has not been divided at all, but instead has been remapped to accommodate color region 210.

Based on the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that Dermer fails to disclose all of the claimed elements as arranged in claim 1. Therefore, under *Hybritech* and *Richardson*, Dermer clearly cannot anticipate the present invention as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable, and further submits that claims 2-5 are allowable as well. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-5.


With respect to independent claims 6 and 7, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable over Dermer for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1, namely the failure to teach or suggest the division of an image represented in the form of polygons into a plurality of image areas or creating band-shaped trapping areas extending along the boundary of a pair of image areas. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the § 102(b) rejection of claims 6 and 7.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APPLN. NO. 10/000,065
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q67493

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Wilson
Registration No. 45,879

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 5, 2004